

### **REMARKS**

This amendment is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action mailed February 8, 2005. In the Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 1, 2, 4-11, and 13-15 are pending and rejected.

By this response, claims 1, 2, 4-11, and 13-15 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer and new claims 16-28 are added. Claims 16-28 contain no new matter and are supported by Applicants' original specification, including the drawings and the original claims.

In view of both the amendments presented above and the following discussion, the Applicants submit that the claims now pending in the application are patentable over the references cited in the Office Action under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §102 and §103. Thus, the Applicants believe that all of these claims are now in allowable form.

It is to be understood that the Applicants, by amending the claims, do not acquiesce to the Examiner's characterizations of the art of record or to the Applicants' subject matter recited in the pending claims. Further, the Applicants are not acquiescing to the Examiner's statements as to the applicability of the art of record to the pending claims by filing the instant responsive amendments.

### **Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102**

#### **Claims 1, 2, and 4**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, and 4 as being clearly anticipated by Kamada (U.S. Patent No. 6,622,306, hereinafter "Kamada"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection, because claims 1, 2, and 4 are cancelled. Furthermore, new claims 16-28 are also patentable over Kamada.

"Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim" (Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co., 730 F.2d 1452, 221 U.S.P.Q. 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984)(citing Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 722 F.2d 1542, 220 U.S.P.Q. 193 (Fed. Cir. 1983)) (emphasis added).

340813-1

Claim 16 recites, *inter alia*, "the video image having a plurality of frames corresponding to HTML frames in at least one web page, the frames being independently controllable sections in the web page" and "providing navigation on the display device, the navigation being in the requested direction from the selected object in the first frame to a different-frame object in a second frame, when the selected object is located at an edge of the first frame in the requested direction, the second frame being in the requested direction from the first frame." Kamada fails to disclose at least these elements of claim 16. The Office Action confused "hot spots" in Kamada with the claimed frames in the video image. One of skill in the art would not confuse these two things. The "hot spots" in Kamada are textual characters that link to another web page when clicked on. By contrast, frames are independently controllable sections in a web page. Frames do not link to another web page or function in any way like "hot spots". Frames are not textual characters or links. They are nothing alike.

The Office Action incorrectly called "hot spot position '1. DIAL-UP'" a frame. (Kamada, Figure 4, col. 7, lines 18-19). Contrary to the assertion in the Office Action, there are no frames in Figure 4 of Kamada and the transfer list in Figure 14 of Kamada has nothing to do with frames. They do have to do with "hot spots", however, which is clear considering Kamada as a whole. Kamada teaches that "hot spots" are links in web pages created using anchor tags and href attributes in HTML. (Kamada, col. 6, line 8 to col. 7, line 4). One of skill in the art knows that frames are sections of a web page in HTML. One of skill in the art knows that the anchor (<a>) tag and the href attribute in HTML is used to create a link to another document. One of skill in the art does not confuse them. Therefore, claim 16 is patentable over Kamada for at least these reasons.

Claims 17-23 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 16 and, thus, inherit the patentable subject matter of claim 16. Therefore, claims 17-23 are also patentable over Kamada.

Claim 24 recites, *inter alia*, "the image including at least one web page having a plurality of frames, the frames being independently controllable sections in the web page, the frames having edges, each frame having at least one object within its edges; a directional guide mapping application for generating directional guide maps and for

providing navigation signals to the browser application, the directional guide maps including linkage between objects and edge of frame indicators associated with objects in frames, the navigation signals including instructions for navigating between frames using edge of frame indicators". For the same reasons given above with respect to claim 16, claim 24 is also patentable over Kamada.

Claims 25-28 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 16 and, thus, inherit the patentable subject matter of claim 16. Therefore, claims 17-23 are also patentable over Kamada.

### **Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103**

#### **Claims 5-6, 9-13, and 15**

The Examiner rejected claims 5-6, 9-13, and 15 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamada in view of Goodman et al. (U.S. Patent 6,100,875, hereinafter "Goodman"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection, because claims 5-6, 9-13, and 15 are cancelled. Furthermore, new claims 16-28 are also patentable over the combination of Kamada and Goodman.

The test under 35 U.S.C. §103 is not whether an improvement or a use set forth in a patent would have been obvious or non-obvious; rather, the test is whether the claimed invention, considered as a whole, would have been obvious. Jones v. Hardy, 110 U.S.P.Q. 1021, 1024 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (emphasis added). Moreover, the invention as a whole is not restricted to the specific subject matter claimed, but also embraces its properties and the problem it solves. In re Wright, 6 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1959, 1961 (Fed. Cir. 1988) (emphasis added). The combination of Kamada and Goodman fails to teach or suggest the Applicants' invention as a whole.

Goodman fails to bridge the substantial gap between Kamada and the claimed invention discussed above, because Goodman also fails to teach or suggest the claimed navigation between frames on a video display.

#### **Claims 7-8**

The Examiner rejected claims 7-8 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamada in view of Johnson et al. (U.S. Patent 5,077,607, hereinafter "Johnson").

The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection, because claims 7-8 are cancelled. Furthermore, new claims 16-28 are also patentable over the combination of Kamada and Johnson.

Johnson fails to bridge the substantial gap between Kamada and the claimed invention discussed above, because Johnson also fails to teach or suggest the claimed navigation between frames on a video display.

#### **Claim 14**

The Examiner has rejected claim 14 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamada in view of Goodman in further view of Johnson. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection, because claim 14 is cancelled. Furthermore, new claims 16-28 are also patentable over the combination of Kamada, Goodman, and Johnson.

Goodman fails to bridge the substantial gap between Kamada and the claimed invention discussed above, because Goodman also fails to teach or suggest the claimed navigation between frames on a video display.

#### **CONCLUSION**

Thus, the Applicants submit that none of the claims, presently in the application, is anticipated or obvious under the respective provisions of 35 U.S.C. §102 or §103. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring adverse final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested

PATENT

Atty. Dkt. No. TVG/WGATES-14

that the Examiner telephone Eamon J. Wall, Esq. at (732) 530-9404 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 4/8/05

E J Wall  
Eamon J. Wall  
Registration No. 39,414  
Attorney for Applicants

MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, LLP  
595 Shrewsbury Avenue, Suite 100  
Shrewsbury, New Jersey 07702  
Telephone: 732-530-9404  
Facsimile: 732-530-9808